

THEY DON'T SHARE LIKE

The East Gets the Largest Part of Government Patronage.

THE CIVIL SERVICE REPORT

The District of Columbia Has Fifty Times as Much Patronage as It Is Entitled to Have—Maryland Exceeds Her Quota Nearly 200 Per Cent.

In its annual report, which is now in the hands of the printer, the Civil Service Commission makes an interesting statement showing how government offices are distributed at Washington. The object of this statement is to prove how much larger than the "spoils" system is the system of the Civil Service Commission. To what extent the statement will carry this proof depends largely on the receipt of condition of the mind to which it is brought. A great many people in and out of Congress will not believe any good of the civil service law. Others are as strongly prejudiced in its favor.

Whatever the statement proves to any one, it is interesting showing of "who's got the button." There is no doubt from the tables presented by the commission that the eastern states and the District of Columbia have the button, and that it is a gold-plated button set with diamonds.

The civil service act provides that "appointments to the public service shall be made by the departments at Washington shall be apportioned among the several states and territories and the District of Columbia upon the basis of population as ascertained at the last preceding census."

The idea was recognized and still is recognized under the patronage system. But under this system the apportionment is necessarily only approximate. That is how it happens that some of the states and the District of Columbia have in service more employees than they were entitled to under an equitable distribution proportioned to their population.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories. For example, the District of Columbia has in service more employees than it was entitled to under an equitable distribution proportioned to its population.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

The District of Columbia the Atlantic states have 7,866 appointments, against an apportionment of 1,917. The northern central states are entitled to 4,194; they have 2,777 appointments. The southern central states are entitled to 2,003; they have 1,003. The western states are entitled to 817; they have 280.

There will likely be one effect of the publication of the civil service report which perhaps the commission has not anticipated—a furious onslaught by the Senators and Representatives from the West on the appointing power. The fact that the people were not getting their share of patronage at Washington has not appealed to the western or southern Congressmen before. It has only made them more determined to make it lively for some of the people of the bureau when it comes to him. If Mr. Roosevelt in making up this statement had any wish to make it lively for some of the people of the bureau who wish to be gratified.

GEORGE GRANTHAM BAIN.

Art Notes.

The notable event in art circles during the past week was the exhibition of oil paintings by Thomas Hendren at V. C. Fischer's art gallery.

Mr. Hendren is a recent newcomer, and as his work enjoys a national if not international fame.

Mr. Hendren will be remembered as the painter of "Breaking of Home Two," which was so generally admired at the Exposition last Summer, and two of the leading pictures in his exhibit treated of the same style of subject, which appeals to all, since they tell a human story. "Grandma's Second Sight" was one of these, and grandma is the dear old lady with no nonsense about her whom we have all seen, if she was not our very own, and the little girl, throwing her arms around her, and looking up at her with her eyes to the dear old lady's service.

The whole composition is most happy in treatment, true to technique, and tells its simple story of life in charming style.

The "Traveling Clock Mender" is another typical figure. The old man's whistled, and the clock mender is a necessary only approximate. That is how it happens that some of the states and the District of Columbia have in service more employees than they were entitled to under an equitable distribution proportioned to their population.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

Naturally, it is impossible to make distribution of places exact. However elaborate the machinery of the civil service act, it is not a perfect machine. There are a number of slight excesses here or deficiency there, but these are made. Then there is a considerable inequality in the distribution of the civil service employees among the several states and territories.

There are 11,747 civil service employees in the department service at Washington. Of these, 3,881 are appointed under the civil service law, or "the merit system," as the commission calls it, and 7,866 are appointed under the patronage system.

A Topic or Two To Think About.

Governor Lovell's manifesto, directed to all boards of police commissioners in Kansas, in defense of the constitutional liberties of tramps, is a very extraordinary document, says Elbert Hubbard, in the Arena. He maintains that the right to go freely from place to place in search of employment, or even in obedience to a mere whim, is a part of that personal liberty guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States to every human being, and that it is the duty of every board of police to maintain it. Even voluntary idleness is not forbidden. Out of 100 editorial clippings, taken at random from papers all over the United States, ninety-three speak in terms of disapprobation of Governor Lovell's action. In this country we say every man is assumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty.

This applies only to men who have money. No penniless, decent man with money is asked to "give an account of himself." But let him have no place to lay his head and ask for a cup of cold water, immediately we are legally assumed his guilt and drag him before the board of police. To state the case in a satisfactory account of himself. Satisfactory to whom, forsooth? Why, to the justice of the peace. And who is he? Often a man who has no money, and who is in a position to know how much of the time of higher courts is taken up in undoing the blunders of rustic justices. Among the first steps to adopt a tramp law was the state of Delaware, on March 27, 1873. Section 1 reads thus:

"Any person who shall be found in town in which he may be found wandering about without employment shall be deemed a tramp and will be liable to be taken to the workhouse."

Will the reader please note that (1) a tramp is a man who has no home in the town where he is found, and (2) that he is found wandering about without employment. To have no home and to seek employment is a crime in many parts of the United States.

Such a law as this is the one against which the most determined opposition has been made. It is a criminal, punishable by his crimes, but do not punish him for being a tramp; to do this may be only to chastise him for his misfortune.

The very original and somewhat startling plea of M. G. Ferrero in the January Month for the complete exemption of women from bread-winning labor, says Prof. Lester F. Ward in the Month, is worthy of the author's chivalrous nature and demands thoughtful consideration. One naturally feels impelled to accept his view, but such a course of practical objection is not to be taken. It is impossible to do so except in a very restricted sense. If he only means that women who actually bear children should be relieved from the duties of bread-winning during their productive period, nobody certainly ought to dissent, and it is to be hoped that the world has already got a long way toward the realization of this ideal. But if he means that one-half of the human race should be exempted from the standard of economic, nonproductive, except in so far as the results of their labor are considered productive, the position cannot be maintained without important qualification.

So far as can be discovered from the article, his author proceeds on the popular but erroneous assumption that every adult female in society is provided with a husband who is both able and willing to supply all her needs. To show how false this assumption is, let us glance for a moment at the official statistics of the United States, which have been compiled for the first time by the census of 1890. These statistics show that at that date the number of female persons of all ages in the United States was 24,370,000. Of these, 18,088,000, or 74.2 per cent, were single. The important fact for our present purpose is the number or percentage of marriageable women who are in fact single. It is found that about 10 per cent, marry before the age of twenty, and a very few before the age of fifteen. As the statistics are compiled in five-year periods, it is impossible to obtain figures for any age between fifteen and twenty, although proper marriageability begins at about sixteen years of age. At the age of twenty, we take twenty as the basis, it appears that there were 16,235,726 female persons of twenty years of age and upward, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 38.4 per cent. If we take fifteen as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent. If we take twenty as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent. If we take twenty as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent.

After this the number of widows increases so rapidly that from forty-five to fifty-five the unmarried number is 20 per cent, and of fifty-five to sixty-five it is 25 per cent, and of sixty-five to seventy-five it is 30 per cent, and of seventy-five to eighty-five it is 35 per cent, and of eighty-five to ninety-five it is 40 per cent, and of ninety-five to one hundred it is 45 per cent. If we take fifteen as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent. If we take twenty as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent. If we take twenty as the basis, the number of that age and upward was 19,662,178, of whom 6,233,307 were unmarried, or nearly 31.7 per cent.

Many of these unmarried women are doubtless cared for in varying degrees by their male relatives, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation? A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

A considerable number of the younger widows, it is true, have families on their hands, but it is not to be denied that a large number of them are in a position to support their families, and admitting that the 75 per cent, who have husbands are provided with the means of support in returning their children, or, if children, as a large proportion always are, in merely attending to the wants of their husbands, what shall be said of the 25 per cent, who are without husbands and are therefore deprived of this occupation?

woman. But his defense is that she was already unchaste when he met her, that she had seduced him, and that he yielded to her temptations, neither loving nor respecting her. The man, however, is a little more than a year or two past his prime, and the woman, the social system will never be sane and whole until this double standard is done away with. The same purity for a man and woman, nothing less will do.

The right to strike, says the Voice, was denied a few weeks ago by Judge Jenkins, of the United States Supreme Court, who issued an injunction restraining the employees of the Northern Pacific railway from "any combination or conspiracy having for its purpose the obstruction of the operation of the railway" (which railway was and is in the hands of a receiver), and "from ordering, inducing or approving by communication or instruction any strike, boycott or other act of violence to the railway."

The real difficulty seems to be that the discontents fail to consider that words and actions are not the same. A man may have no lasting intrinsic value, while ideas are immortal. Thought alone is the body, while words are but the clothing used to fit the era, the sentiment, the temper, and more especially the receptive intellectual conditions of the person or persons addressed; consequently all these factors would have to be brought into the equation, and the most important of all, the translator from one language into another must be of like mind, temperament, and spirit of the original writer before he could be absolutely certain that underneath the verbiage we had gotten down to the bedrock of ideas.

All thoughtful students must feel the truth of this, whether they express it or not, and, perhaps, the closest definition we could give of the currently used terms atheist and agnostic would be that the former aggressively proclaims his thoughts, while the latter keeps his own counsel. But this is it may there be a certain point where such a distinction is not so clear as it seems. The Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.

In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. These words have been accepted as a basis of conduct by the Christian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Protestant, the Christian Scientist, and the Spiritualist.